REFERENCE COPY

RECEIVED 23 JUL 1970

COMMANDERS DIGEST

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE • WASHINGTON, D.C.

Vol. 8, No. 14 July 4, 1970

Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird (center) talks to newsmen at Grafenwoehr, West Germany. At left is German Defense Minister Helmut Schmidt. Press officer at right is unidentified. The Secretary was visiting U. S. forces in Europe.

Brig. Gen. Daniel James Jr. Decries 'Clogged Communications'

"From my own experience and observation Cambodia presents a good example of clogged communications, willful or otherwise."

That statement was made by Brigadier General Daniel James Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, during a speech in Miami, Fla., June 13.

Speaking before Jewish War Veterans (Department of Florida), Brig. Gen. James said:

Although the President has repeatedly made clear his plans to reduce our level of forces in Southeast Asia and has scrupulously honored each of those commitments, I kept hearing on college campuses that additional forces had been sent into Southeast Asia for the purpose of clearing out Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia. It is demonstrable, measurable, ob-

(Continued On Page Two)

Interdiction In Cambodia To Continue, Says SecDef

"After the Cambodian operation, which will end as far as Americans are concerned on the ground June 30, we will carry on an air interdiction campaign and any airpower that is used in Cambodia . . . will be based upon the interdiction of supplies and materiel, interdiction of personnel, to protect Americans in Vietnam, to protect our Vietnamization program, to make withdrawals of American troops a continuing process and to reduce American casualties."

That assertion was made June 26 by Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird as he talked to newsmen upon returning to Washington from a three-week trip visiting American forces stationed in Europe.

The Secretary said the purpose of his trip was to "find out from the Service personnel what were some of the reasons that would cause them to remain in the military service, so that we

(Continued On Page Seven)

General James Decries 'Clogged Communications'

(Continued From Page One)

servable fact that the level of our forces was not increased, yet there are many who do not want to believe.

"I kept hearing that the President would not withdraw U.S. forces from the sanctuaries by the date to which he had repeatedly committed himself. Simple courtesy and justice would seem to dictate that a man not be condemned before he has the opportunity to prove himself yet again worthy of his word.

"I kept hearing that the President was widening the war. As a military man, it seemed much more obvious and sensible to me that, in view of the steady reduction in our forces, the President was seeking to facilitate our continued safe withdrawal while buying time for the South Vietnamese to grow stronger. After all (and I speak from experience) in a street fight you do not turn your back on a man with a knife and simply walk away."

Other excerpts from his speech:

Let me cite another example of fogged communications or muddled thinking, as the case may be. As an F-4 pilot in Southeast Asia and later as a wing commander in Libya, far away from Washington, I was perplexed by the attacks being made on our ROTC activities.

Now in my office at the Pentagon, I am no less perplexed and surely as deeply troubled by these attacks—some of them including vandalism and destruction—which are being made against the ROTC on a number of campuses.

No matter how hard I try, I cannot understand how people who oppose the draft, who want to make military service strictly volunteer, can at the same time try to deny some college students the freedom of opportunity to choose a career as a professional military officer.

I cannot understand in this day when the draft is still a fact of life and when many university students will see military service, why these students do not want some of the officers who might command them to be chosen from their peers as products of the civilian educational environment. I cannot understand how students and some faculty members who espouse freedom of choice can at the same time attempt to prevent military recruiters from visiting certain campuses.

As a citizen, I count highly the need in the officer ranks of our Armed Forces of a mixture of Service Academy graduates, ROTC graduates, and men who have come up from the ranks through our Officer Candidate programs. That has been the American way and I say let's keep it that way.

In our country we want no military elite coming from any single source. What we want and what we need in our Armed Forces are men and women from all walks of life but with a unifying dedication to maintain the strength which is necessary to preserve peace and freedom.

The most difficult and painful communications problem I live with each day results from an information blackout imposed by the enemy concerning our men who are either prisoners of war or missing in action.

What do you say to the mother of six young children whose husband has been missing for five years? She wants to know why you do not know where he is and why you have not gotten him back and she alleges the government has turned its back on her. She is not consoled by the fact that the government is constantly using every channel, every device, every resource, and every strategem possible to determine her husband's fate and to get him back at the earliest possible time.

She is not moved by knowledge of the enormous investment of resources in reaching downed fliers and the remarkable number recovered. All she knows is that her husband has been gone for five years and the world is caving in around her. She can't take it much longer. She lashes out at you verbally because you are there. It hurts but you know it hurts her much more and there is nothing you can do.

She is not alone. More than 1,450 U.S. servicemen are prisoners of war or missing in action in Southeast Asia.

The more than 2,600 primary and secondary next-of-kin of these men are scattered in every one of the 50 states.

Currently only about 440 of the 1,450 men are, with varying degrees of certainty, believed to be prisoners of war. However, I must hasten to point out that this determination has been made without any official confirmation by the enemy.

A few of these men we list as prisoners have been identified as prisoners because they have been allowed to write to their families. Others have been seen in propaganda photographs or heard in propaganda broadcasts from Radio Hanoi. Still others are thought to be prisoners because they are so identified by the few men who have been released or escaped from captivity.

On the shoddy pretext that U. S. captives are not prisoners of war but "criminals," North Vietnam will not allow neutral inspections of its prisoners. Yet such inspections are required under the Geneva Conventions, signed by North Vietnam in 1957 and by 119 other governments.

Using the "criminal" charge to mask its defiance, Hanoi not only has rejected inspection of its camps, but has refused to:

—Identify the prisoners it holds;

—Release the sick and wounded;

—Allow proper flow of letters and packages; or

—Protect U. S. prisoners from public abuse.

The Viet Cong and Communist forces in Laos have followed Hanoi's lead by imposing an even more rigid blackout.

We know our men have been subject to abuse and torture. They have been held in isolation for prolonged periods of time. There have been instances of broken bones being rebroken, fingernails removed, medical attention denied, and diets held at a starvation level. Also, we are aware of at least 19 American prisoners who have been murdered by the enemy or allowed to die from malnutrition and disease.

President Nixon has described the enemy's treatment of American prisoners as "one of the most unconscionable in the history of warfare."

Soviet Fighters Are Seen As A Growing Threat

Secretary of the Air Force Robert C. Seamans Jr. sees Soviet fighters threatening U.S. ability to maintain control of the air in any future conflict and said this is a matter "of deepest concern" to the Air Force.

Speaking before a Rotary Club meeting in Washington, D. C., June 17, the Air Force's top civilian also noted that the Soviets turn out about one new fighter design each year and that they have a new swing-wing bomber prototype.

"We believe our pilots are the best," he said, "but skill and determination can go only so far to compensate for inferior equipment."

The Secretary said the Air Force believes it must develop a new air superiority fighter, the F-15, to meet the challenge of the late 1970s and '80s.

Touching on the prisoner of war and missing in action situation in Southeast Asia, Secretary Seamans said, "We are dedicated to bring about more humane conditions for our American prisoners of war and even more important—to obtain their release."

Some Missing Six Years

Elaborating, the Air Force Secretary told how the men are subjected to extremely harsh treatment such as limited diets, physical mistreatment and only rudimentary medical attention. Perhaps most inexplicable, he said, is Hanoi's policy regarding letters, naming those captured, and inspection of the camps where these men are held.

Some of our men have been prisoners or missing for six years, longer than in any other war, the Secretary continued. Despite repeated pleas from our government, from private agencies and from families of the men involved, Hanoi has never even named all the men it holds or identified those killed in action or who may have died in captivity.

"We should also not forget," he said, "that North Vietnam has never permitted inspection of the POW camps as specified in the Geneva Convention to which Hanoi is a signatory."

Secretary Seamans also touched on Vietnamization, education, housing and pollution in his speech. Following are excerpts on those subjects:

Vietnamization

We are working closely with the Vietnamese Air Force. It has already grown to 22 squadrons and its attack sorties have increased more than 40 per cent in the last year. This year more than 3,500 pilots and aircraft mechanics will be trained in the United States, but the real emphasis is being shifted to in-country training whenever possible. Nha Trang Air Base has been turned over to the Vietnamese and has become their air training center. Preparations are underway to just about double the Vietnamese Air Force to 40 squadrons. The additional people have been recruited and are being trained now.

Education

One of the prerequisites to solving many current issues is more effective education—education which is geared toward preparing the individual for a productive, rewarding role in our economy and in his personal life. To do this, the educational system must be able to work effectively with people of widely varying backgrounds and abilities.

The Air Force has a lot of experience in education and training. In fact, we are the largest educational institution in the world. Our programs run the gamut: basic military training, technical training, flying training, professional education, the Air Force Academy, Air Force ROTC, many correspondence and on-base education courses, and 149 schools in 16 countries serving 63,000 dependent students. Each year we deal with more than two million students.

Housing

A second important area of national concern is housing, and providing attractive, adequate housing at reasonable cost is also of great significance in retaining highly skilled Air Force personnel. At George AFB in California we are planning 200 housing units which will be constructed in various combinations of standard modules produced by a test factory at a rate of about one per day. The total project cost is expected to be 15 to 20 per cent lower than conventional construction.

For another of our housing projects we used a computer to analyze more than 350 construction methods and materiel combinations in terms of life cycle cost. That is, the total cost included not only initial construction expense but also lifetime operation and maintenance costs. We found that in many cases a slight increase in initial construction cost can eventually mean long-term savings. Everything we learn in the housing area we are making available to the civilian community and to other government agencies.

Pollution

Pollution control is probably receiving more publicity than any other single domestic issue. For fiscal '71 the Air Force has budgeted about $18 million for facilities to reduce air and water pollution. We expect that $18 million to jump to about $47 million in '72 as standards, plans and processes are approved. These figures do not include our sizable efforts to minimize the pollution products of jet aircraft engines, to reduce noise, and to control automotive emissions.

Marine Corps Commandant Warns Of 'New Dangers'

We're living in a "new" and "different" world today, but the Marine Corps' top officer can see that "its very newness presents some new dangers."

General Leonard F. Chapman Jr., Commandant of the Marine Corps' asks the question: "Where would the hope of a new America in a new world be, if quitting our defense invited destruction?"

Speaking at the National Press Club in Washington, D. C., June 23, the general explored this "new world" and linked it with the security of the United States, its defenses and potential adversaries.

Following are excerpts from Gen. Chapman's speech:

Americans are tired of war—and not just this war, but all war. Americans are tired of the preparations for war—and tired of the hardware and posture such preparations impose. But that hardware and that posture are necessary for defense, too.

And yet it's no wonder we are weary. For 30 years, ever since 1940, we have had to work toward preparations for defense. For more than 12 of these 30 years, American fighting men have actually been engaged in combat. Because of this we are sincerely looking for new ways to establish a lasting peace. Some Americans are even to the point of considering the possibility of stacking all weapons, and simply announce "We quit." Well, that's a fresh approach in the 20th Century, and it might work. But what if it didn't work? Where would the hope of a new America in a new world be, if quitting our defense invited destruction?

This is indeed a new world, totally different than the world of 1940-to-1960. And America is finding a new place in this new world. But I want to point out that its very newness presents some new dangers.

Now, as we disengage from combat in Vietnam and look inward, other nations look outward. Now, as we grow tired of our defensive machinery and begin a reduction in force, other countries are building up their military and naval power. Well, if we are going to look inward, and seek a new level of defensive strength, we must look very carefully, and we must match that strength to the possible test it may face.

At this point, I'd like to cut away some of the rhetoric growing so abundantly in our national garden. Because behind that rhetoric is the single purpose of American arms in the 1970s. That purpose, quite simply, is the defense of the American people. I think that purpose is strong enough to stand without the aid of a great many adjectives. And I think that purpose is honest enough to survive the fashionable accusations of the day. But as strong and as honest as the purpose of American defense may be, it must constantly seek its probable level of useful application in a real environment.

Well, our *real environment* is that of a giant island. Surrounded by the two largest oceans of this earth, and blessed with the best of warm water ports, we have traditionally looked to the sea for our security and strength. In our past our environment provided us with the very real security of space and time. The sea presented a mass of space to be overcome by any potential enemy, and that gave us time to prepare.

Because of friendly space and time, we were able to develop a doctrine of "wait it out." Now, that period of American defense has passed. Now, technology has compressed space and rushed the clock. Space and time can no longer be counted as mainstays of American security.

But the sea is still there, and we still have the capability of using it as an ally. There are two very good reasons for this, I think.

First, a rough nuclear parity now exists between the two major powers of the world. It's a parity in both hardware and human desire. We have made it crystal clear it is not our policy to consider a first nuclear strike. And we sincerely hope, and really don't believe, that any nation would be insane enough to unleash the destruction of mankind.

That same rough parity secondly covers—to a lesser degree—the possibilities of a full confrontation of large armies and air forces in massive land war.

There is no doubt that Russia has developed its navy to the point that it dares challenge our position on the seas. In April of this year, the Soviet Navy conducted a worldwide naval exercise involving more than 200 ships. And there are more. Sleek and fast new cruisers, destroyers, and large torpedo boats—all missile-armed—have shown themselves in strong, bold formations in the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean, and even the sea historians love to call "an American lake"—the Caribbean. More than 350 Soviet submarines, nuclear as well as conventional, show themselves little, but make their presence felt all over the world.

The Navy-Marine Corps team of this new decade must be a complete force—a highly mobile line of outposts, capable of moving to any critical area instantly. The mobility and proven worth of carrier-based aviation, surface vessels, submarines, and Fleet Marine Forces can keep our oceans broad—can keep a fight from our own shores.

But there is yet another area in which we must be careful in maintaining our defenses. It is an area no enemy has ever been able to penetrate, and yet, the danger is always present. I'm talking about quality—not quality in hardware, but quality in people.

Certainly we will continue to require top quality equipment, weapons, aircraft and vessels. But they can be only as good as the men who will man them. That is our real defense, the Americans who will serve this country.

If we are to eliminate the draft, cut defense spending, and still hope to meet the increasing demands of the security of this country, then every American who wears a uniform must count full measure. Each individual must offer quality service, professional ability and—most of all—dedication.

Aerospace Rescue, Recovery Service Lauded For Record

The Aerospace Rescue and Recovery Service has achieved 2,119 combat saves in Southeast Asia since 1964 and General Jack J. Catton, Commander of the Military Airlift Command, said he is justifiably proud of the unit.

The general—who is responsible for helicopter rescues of downed personnel—explained his pride in a talk before the American Helicopter Society, Inc., in Washington, D.C., June 17.

". . . it is the performance of that particular mission which gives me more of a warm feeling and glowing pride than any other.

"I speak, of course, of Aerospace Rescue and Recovery, whose mission is so dependent upon 'sustained hover and steep gradient' flight."

Gen. Catton then explained why his pride is so profound:

"My pride is accented by today's extreme contrasts—with dedicated, determined airmen risking their lives to save their buddies in the hostile environment of Southeast Asia—and here at home some dissenters expressing their dissatisfaction outside the framework of the law—it is no wonder that some of our citizens are confused.

"We don't give enough of our attention to the brave, young Americans in Southeast Asia who are fighting for their country, and far too much to the unlawful, spectacular protestors.

"What is *really* wrong with this picture is perhaps not immediately apparent—I think it is very important that we do understand what is wrong. In the case of the American serviceman, we should remember that he is in the military service, that the military does not conceive and establish national policy, but rather does its utmost to meet the objectives established by our civilian leaders—who are elected by the American people.

"In the second case, the fact that some are dissenting is not wrong. What is wrong is that the dissension is finding its voice outside the framework of law from which all Americans derive their freedom.

"Yes—it is against that kind of background that I feel such great pride in the performance of our American airmen with the Aerospace Rescue and Recovery Service who are performing so brilliantly 'that others may live.'

"A few statistics—I think—speak most eloquently. Since the Gulf of Tonkin incident in 1964, these men have achieved 2,119 combat saves in Southeast Asia; 2,072 of these were made by our helicopters—the Pedros (H-43s) and the Jolly Greens (the H-3s and 53s).

"During the same period—throughout the world—this Service has been responsible for 4,143 non-combat saves—3,536 of these were accomplished by helicopters. You can see that these folks have not only been very busy, but certainly we are most dependent upon the helicopter to perform the job.

"I think one of the most satisfying consequences of our military experience in Southeast Asia has been the very rapid and successful development of our combat rescue mission. Today it represents one of the finest demonstrations of teamwork I have ever seen. This is teamwork within the Air Force as well as among the Services."

PLANTERS—Colonel Alva J. Moore, Deputy Commander, Korea Support Command (front) and Colonel Raymond C. Bishop, Commanding Officer, SROKA Det, KMAG (beside Colonel Moore) take part in Korea Agriculture Day activities by helping to plant rice near Taegu, Korea. (U.S. Army Photo by SSG Wayne Brendt)

COMMANDERS DIGEST

THIS PUBLICATION CONTAINS OFFICIAL INFORMATION, NEWS AND POLICY, DIRECT FROM WASHINGTON AUTHORIZED SOURCES.

Published weekly by American Forces Press Service, 1117 N. 19th St., Arlington, Va. 22209, a unified activity of the Office of Information for the Armed Forces, OASD (M&RA). Reproduction of content is authorized. Suggested dateline for materials used is WASHINGTON (AFPS).

Success Of Vietnamization Program Aids NATO

The success of the Vietnamization program has had a direct and salutary effect on NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization] forces, according to Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird.

Mr. Laird told newsmen aboard USS Franklin D. Roosevelt in the Mediterranean that "We have been able to improve our position as far as our NATO forces are concerned and those committed to NATO because of the success we have had during the last 12 months with the Vietnamization program.

"As you know, the first troop reduction was announced at the time of the Midway Conference, and in a rather short period of 12 months substantial reductions have been made in our force commitment in Vietnam. And this has made possible an improvement of our force structure—particularly the combat effectiveness and combat readiness—of our forces assigned to NATO.

Lower Troop Level

"Within a very few months, as a matter of fact on Oct 15, we will be down at the lowest troop level as far as Vietnam is concerned at any time during the last four-year period. Since I have been in this position, transferring from the Legislative branch to the Executive branch, our troop commitment as far as Vietnam has been going down and down. And prior to that time, for four straight years, it had gone up and up, every month.

"And this is because of the progress we have had in the Vietnamization program and I particularly like to pay tribute to the Navy and the manner in which they've carried forward on their parts of the Vietnamization program. They will be the first to complete Phase I of Vietnamization, and that turnover will be made within a few weeks in Vietnam when all of the responsibility as far as the Riverine force in IV Corps, the lower portion of Vietnam, is turned over to the South Vietnamese and placed under their complete control."

In response to a question, Mr. Laird explained that "We were able to improve the readiness of our forces assigned to NATO, because for a few years after the decision was made in 1965 to deploy American troops in a major way on the ground in Vietnam, there was some cannibalizing done of equipment and this had an effect on the readiness of our forces.

Progress In Program

"And I am pleased to report (of) those forces that, because of the progress of the Vietnamization program, we have been able to bring that readiness up to a very marked degree during the last 14 or 15 months. And this has been possible because of the progress with the Vietnamization program in turning over a greater responsibility to the forces of the South Vietnamese —both the regular, the popular, and the regional forces.

"As far as troop levels are concerned, I have been spending a great portion of my time testifying before the Congress. I have been informed that I spent twice as much time as all the rest of the Cabinet combined testifying before congressional committees. And one of the things that is before the Congress of great importance is the request which has been made by President Nixon to fund our troop levels as far as Europe is concerned in 1971 at approximately the same level as 1970.

"Now, I realize that the Congress is a co-equal branch of the government. As a former member of that body, I don't want to go out—too far out—on a limb predicting what they will do, because they have equal and co-equal responsibility with the Executive branch of our government.

The President's Desire

"But I am confident from the testimony and the questions that I have been asked on the '71 budget, that we will be able to maintain the force structure which is funded in that budget. This is the President's desire, and as Secretary of Defense of this Administration I have done everything that I could to convince my former colleagues in the Congress not to make reduction in this area in fiscal year 1971."

The Secretary was asked whether an increase in strength was planned for the Sixth Fleet in view of the Russian threat growing in the Mediterranean along the coast of North Africa. He said:

"We have submitted to the Congress a rock-bottom, barebones budget for 1971. This budget has been reduced substantially. As a matter of fact, we have come down in our budget level from over $80 billion to over—slightly over—$71 billion in a short period of time. We have gone from 8.7 per cent to 7 per cent of our Gross National Product. We have gone from 44 per cent of our budget—our national budget for national security—down to 34 per cent of our budget devoted to national security. There perhaps will be some further cuts on the '71 budget. I believe that this will be a mistake. Any further reduction would put us in a place where we would have to reassess not only our base structure in the United States, but it would also force us to look over the various ship deployments and other economies which would be forced should the Congress reduce this 1971 budget further.

Predictions On Funds

"I believe that it would be a very bad mistake on their part, but I have seen predictions from the members of the Appropriations Committees and others that there will be further reductions. I hope that there are not further reductions. And as Secretary of Defense, I can assure you that I will see that everything is done not only by the civilian leadership of the Department of Defense but by the Joint Chiefs and by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs to alert the Congress to the problems that would be caused by the further reductions to the 1971 budget."

The Secretary was then asked whether it is possible that the Sixth Fleet's strength would actually be reduced if the budget continues to be cut despite the fact the Russian fleet is growing. He answered that it is possible, adding, "There is no question about that, because the presence of the Sixth Fleet, the presence of our military forces, whether they be Navy, Marine, Army and Air Force, is subject to budget review by the Congress of the United States.

"So, when you ask about possibilities, as a former member of the Legislative branch of our government, I would have to

(Continued On Next Page)

(Continued From Preceding Page)

answer your question in the affirmative—it is possible. I believe that it would be taking a very grave gamble, a risk which I would never recommend as far as our country is concerned, and as far as our people are concerned.

A Frank Answer

"But your question was, 'Is it possible', and I had to give you a frank answer. There is a possibility because the Legislative branch does have a responsibility in this area, too. This would not be done under the budget, however, that we have submitted to the Congress."

A reporter mentioned that the Russians have what he termed "a very economical ship" in the Mediterranean which fires sea-to-sea missiles. He asked Mr. Laird if any thought had been given to matching that capability. The Secretary said, "There has been talk from time to time that the requirements the United States Navy has for the future, particularly the '70s and '80s, are a little bit different than the requirements which the Soviet Union has to operate close-in to their particular country. Their defense requirements are somewhat different than the United States' so I would not want to recommend that we pattern our naval forces after the Soviet naval forces."

Secretary Laird chats with General James H. Polk, Commander In Chief, United States Army in Europe at Grafenwoehr, West Germany, during the Secretary's recent visit.

U. S. Interdiction In Cambodia To Be Continued, Says SecDef

(Continued From Page One)

can move in the direction of a zero draft call.

"It's been a very worthwhile trip and I believe gives me a greater insight, not only of the problems of our Service personnel abroad, but it gave me the opportunity to express some of our concern, to express and to explain completely our program of Vietnamization as far as Southeast Asia is concerned, and it gave me a very good opportunity to explain the military and foreign policy aspects of President Nixon's program."

Q: Mr. Secretary, I hate to bring you back with a jolt to some of your current problems at the Pentagon, but has the policy of interdiction and bombing of Cambodia been extended to include the combat air support of both the ARVN and the Cambodian armies in Cambodia?

A: I made very clear, as I testified before the Foreign Relations Committee back early in May, the policy that our government would pursue as far as air support was concerned. After the Cambodian operation, which will end as far as Americans are concerned on the ground on June 30, we will carry on an air interdiction campaign and any airpower that is used in Cambodia will be based upon the interdiction of supplies, of personnel that threaten the Vietnamization program, that threaten Americans that are engaged in military operations in Vietnam. The primary emphasis will be on the interdiction of supplies, materiel and personnel.

Q: What effect do you suppose, Mr. Secretary, our interdiction campaign will have on Cambodian troops fighting on the ground? Will it benefit them?

A: I would think that there would be an ancillary benefit, of course, regarding the troops on the ground, but the primary reason for the air activities will be the protection of Americans in South Vietnam. But I would be less than frank or candid with you if there would not be a side effect as far as Cambodian and South Vietnamese troops operating within Cambodia, but the primary reason for the air operations still will be in accordance with the testimony which I gave to the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate and I'll be glad to break that out for you so that you can review it.

Q: Do you rule out close air support for the Cambodians in the future?

A: I do not believe that it's good practice as far as military planning is concerned to give flat answers on operating orders as far as the future is concerned. I can assure you, however, that the primary reason will be as I stated before the Foreign Relations Committee, the primary reasons for carrying on air activities in Cambodia will be interdiction of supplies and materiel, interdiction of personnel, to protect Americans in Vietnam, to protect our Vietnamization program, to make withdrawals of American troops a continuing process and to reduce American casualties.

Q: Mr. Secretary, do you have any major changes or recommendations in mind as a result of your trip to Europe?

A: I do have certain recommendations which I will make to the President. I do not care to get into the details of those recommendations until I have had the opportunity of making a report to the President, our Commander in Chief.

Q: Can you tell us whether it is true that our forces in Europe have dropped down to as low as 250,000 in recent months? The published figures show 310,000.

A: No, that is not the case. I would like to report that our forces in Europe are in a much better state of combat effectiveness and combat readiness than they were 15 or 16 months ago. I was impressed with the manner in which the combat effectiveness of our forces in Europe has been improved, the U.S. forces, during the past 15 or 16 months.

Security Of Europe Is Fundamental Concern Of U.S.

In a recent address at the Naval Academy Foreign Affairs Conference, Richard F. Pedersen, Counselor at the Department of State, explored the new and enlarged role that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization may have in the coming decade. Excerpts from his address are given here.

In the aftermath of the Second World War we and the nations of Western Europe created a structure of institutions designed to safeguard "the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded in democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law" as the North Atlantic Treaty states it. In so doing we agreed that an armed attack against any member of the Alliance—in Europe or in North America —would be an attack against them all. Provisions were included for mutual assistance against such attack, and concrete measures were adopted to establish a coordinated military command and institutions for its political supervision.

This NATO system provided—and still provides—the secure foundation which has made possible the remarkable political, social and economic progress of Western Europe. There is every reason to believe that during the 1970s this basic factor in European security will remain unchanged.

Moves Toward Unity

This does not mean that the situation in Europe has remained static or that new situations—with new opportunities —will not face us in the near future. Far from it. Western Europe is vastly stronger materially than it was only a few years ago. The movement toward Western European unity has taken a new lease on life.

Prospects of a more stable Europe can be seen in our Strategic Arms Limitations Talks with the USSR, in expanding levels of trade among the countries of Europe, in the Federal Republic's new *Ostpolitik*, and in other developments.

At the same time Europe is still divided, geographically and politically. The invasion of Czechoslovakia weighs heavily as a harsh reminder of the limits of tolerance and the reliance upon force which still characterizes much of Soviet policy.

The challenge of our European diplomacy in the 1970s will be to encourage closer cooperation among the countries of Eastern and Western Europe without losing sight of these realities and without weakening the balance of relative security which NATO now provides. We must seek every opportunity for improving relations with the countries of Eastern Europe.

The drastically increased capabilities of Western Europe have led to some rethinking about the patterns of relationship within the Western Alliance both on our part and on the part of European members. This by no means signifies a modification of our basic attitude. The security of Europe is of fundamental concern to our own security.

At the same time, we believe that we should be in a less dominant role than in the past—that we should consult our allies more carefully, that NATO should be a more balanced association, and that the European share of the burden of defense should be increased.

We are encouraged that moves are already being made in this direction. Many of our Western European allies will increase their defense budgets this year. Most of these increases will be in the five-to-eight per cent range. The United Kingdom has also announced plans to return a brigade to West Germany.

It is encouraging that a variety of talks are going on now. If they are carried out in good faith, and if they produce concrete results, we can build on that beginning to extend our relationships further. The division of Europe is, after all, an unnatural one. Twenty-five years after the end of World War II, the time has surely come to end it.

POW Report Held 'Unacceptable'

A recent report by private individuals on the status of American prisoners of war held by the North Vietnamese has been termed by the Department of Defense "incomplete and unacceptable."

Daniel Z. Henkin, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, issued the following statement June 26:

"The purported list of prisoners of war held in North Vietnam released unofficially in recent days by a group of private individuals, some of whom have been invited to visit Hanoi, is incomplete and unacceptable. This list, for example, does not include the names of at least 40 men whom we carry as being 'captured.' Our official designation has been made on the basis of information previously received, including men shown in propaganda newsreel films, and photographs released by Hanoi, radio broadcasts, identification by the nine men who have been released, and from other sources.

"Also, it should be noted, this privately compiled and unofficially released list makes no reference to our men held prisoner by Hanoi and its agents in South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

"On behalf of the Secretary of Defense, Melvin R. Laird, I want to state that the Department of Defense will press unrelentingly for full adherence by Hanoi to the provisions of the Geneva Convention. What we want from the enemy is a complete and official identification of all men who are prisoners, including civilian newsmen, and a full accounting of all military and civilians who are missing.

"The Geneva Convention, to which Hanoi is a signator, requires the prompt official identification of all men who are held prisoners. It also provides for impartial inspection of prisoners of war camps, a regular flow of mail, and the repatriation of sick and wounded.

"The unofficial release of an inaccurate and incomplete list of names from unofficial sources can only add to the great anguish of the hundreds of wives, children and parents of the more than 1,500 servicemen who are listed as missing or captured."

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.
Price 5 cents (single copy). Subscription Price: $2.50 per year; $3.25 additional for foreign mailing.
☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1970 434-367/T-1